DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 202 HE 008 867

TITLE	Renewal and New Directions in the Church on Campuses. Occasional Papers on Catholic Higher Education, Volume 2, Number 2.
INSTITUTION	National Catholic Educational Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	25p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Catholic Educational Association, College and University Department, One Dupont Circle, Suite 770, Washington, D.C. 20036
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; *Catholic Educators; Catholic Schools; *Church Related Colleges; *Church Role; College Faculty; *Colleges; College Students; Higher Education; Judaism; *Religious Education; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Campus Ministry; Small Colleges

ABSTRACT

Contents include: "gaudium et spes" and campus ministry at a Catholic university (Daniel Germann); campus minister and president: partners in service (Charles L. Currie); lay ministry on a Catholic campus (Jennifer Konecky); campus ministry in a small institution: a model (James D. Poisson); campus ministry to and by faculty members (Monica K. Hellwig); Jewish-Christian ecumenical activity on campus (Lawrence J. Madden); spiritual direction in a university setting (George Winzenburg, T. Michael McNulty); and new directions: notes (Mary K. Himens, F. Stephen Macher). (MSE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED138202

FOCUS ON CAMPUS MINISTRY

OCCASIONAL PAPERS
On Catholic Higher Education

Renewal and New Directions in the Church on Campuses

Foreword . . . . . *Msgr. John F. Murphy* 2

Introduction . . . . . *Rev. Lawrence Madden, S.J., editor* 3

Gaudium et Spes and Campus Ministry at a Catholic University . . . . . *Rev. Daniel Germann, S.J.* 4

Campus Minister and President: Partners in Service . . . . . *Rev. Charles L. Currie, S.J.* 9

Lay Ministry on a Catholic Campus . . . . . *Jennifer Konecky* 11

Campus Ministry in a Small Institution: A Model . . . . . *Rev. James D. Poisson, O.S.C.* 14

Campus Ministry To and By Faculty Members . . . . . *Monica K. Hellwig* 16

Jewish-Christian Ecumenical Activity on Campus . . . . . *Rev. Lawrence J. Madden, S.J.* 18

Spiritual Direction in a University Setting . . . . *Rev. George Winzenburg, S.J.* *Rev. T. Michael McNulty, S.J.* 20

New Directions: Notes by *Mary K. Himens, S.S.C.M.* and *Rev. F. Stephen Macher, C.M.* 23

HE 008 367

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Volume II, Number 2

Winter 1976

2

National Catholic Educational Association
College and University Department

Foreword

For over a decade there has been a very spirited discussion on college campuses about the nature and function of campus ministry. The previous model was invariably that of a priest chaplain, only rarely aided by lay persons (usually students) in very secondary positions. The college chaplain celebrated the Liturgy, provided opportunities for the Sacraments, gave spiritual counsel, arranged retreats and pre-marital instructions. On some campuses he served as moderator to apostolic groups, such as the Young Christian Students (YCS) or the National Federation of Catholic College Students (NFCCS). While he was often truly helpful to individual students who sought him out, he was hardly significant to the central life on campus. A chaplain went with a Catholic college like the crucifix on the classroom wall and the prayer opening the classroom lecture.

The college or university budget generally reflected the low esteem in which the role of ministry was held, and it seldom occured to chief administrators to find a place in the structures of decision-making for the chaplain so that he could exercise institution-wide influence. In fairness to the presidents, they often kept the chaplain outside the lines of authority and reporting precisely to give him independence in performing his pastoral duties to the students.

Relations with the local Church were usually minimal, often reduced to obtaining faculties for visiting retreat masters and warding off complaints from local pastors, disturbed that an "outsider" was moving in on *their* turf with *their* parishioners. (The most severe "attack" on the local pastor was for a young parishioner to request his/her college chaplain to officiate at the marriage ceremony!)

Since most Catholic colleges and universities were sponsored by a religious community, the appointment of a campus chaplain often took a peculiar turn. Some clerical communities did not want the bishop "interfering" on their campus, while institutions sponsored by non-clerical religious would at times be assigned a priest infirm of body or spirit. Secular campuses often did better. Bishops assumed a responsibility there and gave an attention that was sometimes not welcome elsewhere, or (often in the case of sisters' colleges) was totally inadequate to the need.

I do not mind reciting this often dreary history because I think the current situation shows that a happy ending is on the way. Not only is the basic meaning of campus ministry undergoing thoughtful examination, but the authorities in the institutions and in the local churches are beginning to pay serious attention to ways of developing its role.

I think there are three major questions under discussion now: what campus ministry is; what should be its relationships with the local church; who does it. The last question: who does it, is getting particular attention. A veritable treasure of personnel is being opened for us to see and support. Lay people, men and women religious, youth themselves in peer ministry are all coming forward as leaders of the faith community on the campus. It is a development which should be welcomed by all. We do not know the answers for the difficult ministry on the campus; I am not sure we have even asked all the right questions. But the Spirit of God is way ahead of us in inspiring many to bring their talents and their dedication to the task. The Catholic campus has a marvelous opportunity to experience and to experiment with various models of adult Christian communities. Encouragement and support should be expressed in meaningful fashion.

Presidents and the college communities they head, particularly the campus ministry component (no longer an isolated but a *team* ministry), should be able to look to their local bishops for support, for trust, for understanding leadership. It is happily evident to all who will bother to look that more and more bishops are anxious to give just that. The "we" and "they" mistrust which so often marred relations between chancery and university can be replaced by a new model of healthy dialogue and cooperation.

These remarks, then, quite naturally introduce this special issue of *Occasional Papers on Catholic Higher Education*. Because of the upbeat response from all sides to new initiatives in campus ministry on Catholic campuses, we asked one of the more perceptive leaders, Father Lawrence J. Madden, S.J. of Georgetown University, to collect and edit a series of papers which would advance the valuable discourse on this important ministry. The College and University Department is grateful to Father Madden and to his contributors. It is our hope that their words will stimulate further in-depth analysis on where we have been, are now, and should go. Action models, thus rooted in careful theological reflection, should be welcomed and developed on many Catholic campuses.

Msgr. John F. Murphy
Executive Director

Introduction

Campus Ministry on Catholic campuses is maturing. This newly developed structural tool which Catholic institutions of higher learning have adopted to help them accomplish their religious mission is receiving more adequate financial support, better prepared personnel, and ministers with greater stability in office. As the agency which not only promotes but reflects the church on campus, Campus Ministry is showing lines of development which one sees in the Church at large. As you read through this collection of articles, I call your attention to three themes contained in the papers: (1) a developing understanding of "the church" as a network of mature, personal relationships in the Spirit; (2) an awakened sense of the ministry of every Christian, a sense of shared responsibility and leadership; (3) a spirituality which develops a close interior link between our desires to change the world for the better and to celebrate the present gift of the Lord in his creation. This third phenomenon may be the least explicit in the following papers, but it is strongly implied in many of them and is felt if only by the absence of disputes between the "world changers" and the "life celebrators" of a few years ago.

Daniel Germann's paper outlines three closely related insights of the Second Vatican Council and gives a theological grounding to the approaches being taken in the campus apostolate today. A sense of shared leadership and responsibility for the ministry is clearly reflected in the contributions of Charles Currie S.J., Monica Hellwig and Jennifer Konecky, who reflect on the particular religious ministry of the president of the institution, the faculty member and the lay minister. George Winzenburg S.J. and T. Michael McNulty S.J.'s paper on spiritual direction reflects a well-developed and firmly established program in this vital area that could provide a model for other campuses. My own remarks on Jewish-Christian ecumenical activity suggest a particular advantage which the campus church has in this relatively recent but critical area in virtue of its being a pluralistic religious community. It might serve as a model for development on the parish level.

Every campus ministry structure must be tailored to its particular campus situation. One model is presented for your consideration and stimulation in the paper of James Poisson, O.S.C. Another area that needs reflection and articulation at some future date is that of involvement of campus ministers in the formation of curricular changes, faculty development and institutional modification. Such activity emerges out of the campus minister's responsibility to be spokesman (or woman) for the religious mission of the institution. Cooperative work with college officials to eliminate dehumanizing conditions in dormitories, work with faculty to develop value-oriented courses or interdisciplinary study of critical problems such as world hunger, calling the attention of academic officials to subject matter or methodologies that do or do not promote conditions for faith—these are samples of current efforts by campus ministers. It is to be hoped that the dialogue among campus ministers initiated here will provide a stimulus for further discussion.

My sincere thanks are extended to Sister Alice Gallin osu, the Associate Executive Director, College & University Department of the NCEA and Dr. Margaret Healy, Chairperson of the Campus Ministry Committee of the NCEA, for their substantial help in the production of this issue.

Lawrence J. Madden, S.J.
Director of Campus Ministries
Georgetown University

Gaudium et Spes and Campus Ministry at a Catholic University

INTRODUCTION

On December 7, 1965, the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council promulgated one of the Council's final and most significant documents: *The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, often referred to by the opening words of its Latin text: *Gaudium et Spes*. The following day Vatican II solemnly closed its deliberations and the post-conciliar era had begun. The Catholic Church would never be the same again.

Catholic higher education is one area presently being reconsidered and restructured in reference to the challenges of the times and the new consciousness generated by Vatican II. This is especially true of campus ministry, the apostolic work carried out nowadays often by a pastoral team of priests, religious and laity working in cooperation with members of the college and university communities in order to enhance the quality of Christian life in those environments. This ministry has a long and edifying history on Catholic, Protestant, and secular campuses in this country. But, as in so many other areas, Vatican II has greatly influenced and changed this apostolate. Thus campus ministry has emerged in recent years with a whole new vitality incarnated in widely diverse shapes.

This present study is hardly an attempt to articulate all the contributions of the Council to the present shaping of campus ministry. The scope here is much more limited. After briefly indicating the changed perspective that has occured in recent years in campus ministry at a Catholic university, three closely related conciliar insights (found most clearly expressed in *Gaudium et Spes*) will be critically examined; and finally, these insights will be used to provide a basis for understanding and developing this apostolate at a Catholic university.

Underlying this study is not only research into all the documents of Vatican II but also six years' work in campus ministry on a Catholic campus.[1] This experience has borne out the view that the conciliar insights singled out here do provide a basis for developing such a ministry. The study is being presented both as an opportunity to share these reflections with others engaged in this ministry and to raise the broader question as to whether the conclusions drawn here are analogously applicable in other areas as Catholics seek to discern and incarnate in fresh ways what it means to be Christian in today's world.

THE CHANGED PERSPECTIVE

In the late 1950's, students at an American Catholic university received the following notice: "All students, Catholics as well as non-Catholics, are obliged to attend the annual retreat—Anyone who has not fulfilled his obligation of making a retreat during the Fall semester will not receive his semester grades until he has made a retreat at a retreat house." Probably no one was particularly surprised. This notice expressed a policy widely held for a long time at such institutions. Mandatory retreats, Masses, chapel talks, counseling sessions were all interwoven with the academic life in such a way that one's personal Christian development was carried out not only in the context of academic life, but under the protection of academic sanctions and privileges. The Catholic university resembled a Catholic state, set apart from the rest of the world. The campus ministry—ordinarily referred to then as the chaplaincy—was very much part of that institutional structure.

A considerably different perspective is reflected in this excerpt from "The Catholic University in the Modern World," a report issued by the Second Congress of Delegates of the Catholic Universities of the World, at the conclusion of its meeting in Vatican City November 1972:

> Campus ministry, like the strictly academic activities of the university, must be inspired by a profound respect for human freedom, which is an indispensable basis for human and Christian growth of personality. It is only on this basis that the Catholic university can form mature persons who will not tolerate a "divorce between the faith that they profess and the lives they lead," but rather "will unite their human, domestic, professional, scientific, or technical endeavors into a vital synthesis with their religious values."[2]

A shift of outlook is clear. The student is no longer viewed as living in a special "Catholic world" or "Christendom" while at the university, a world in which one can develop as a Christian within a structured context of special privileges and sanctions. Rather, the student is viewed as already living

in the world, and being Christian in that world. Not a "divorce" but a "vital synthesis" is called for. This change of perspective is solidly rooted in Vatican II. There, the adult Christian is urged to be deeply present to the needs and concerns of today's world. This person is to be there not in spite of but because of being Christian. One's task in this world is the humanization of the life shared with others on this planet. Such a task is carried out in the very midst of the world of human thought and action, of human institutions, without any pressure for these activities somehow to be baptized and thus made appropriate areas of Christian presence. Not, then, by withdrawal from the world, but there, in the very midst of such a deeply human existence is the Christian to discover and respond to God and to live out this response in a Christ-shaped life of service to others.

Those in campus ministry anywhere, and *a fortiori* in a Catholic university, find themselves called upon to discover ways to enable those whom they serve to grow into such a Christian presence in the world, not only "after graduation" but even as they experience the less explicitly Christian elements of their education.

THE INSIGHTS OF *GAUDIUM ET SPES*

The documents of Vatican II, having a diverse, composite authorship, do not always manifest a consistent line of thought. A critical analysis of *Gaudium et Spes*, however, does corroborate the perspective just enunciated. This can be expressed in what it says of three interrelated themes:

1. The adult Christian is called to a life deeply involved in the world;
2. The basis for this involvement is the Christian's shared responsibility for the promotion of culture;
3. Such a presence calls for a genuine respect for the rightful autonomy of created reality.

The Adult Christian in the World

Gaudium et Spes was one of the final documents promulgated by the Council. Not only its subject matter but also its stature as a pastoral Constitution makes it a significant and mature expression of conciliar thought on the question of the Christian in the world.

This Constitution, although sometimes speaking of the roles of bishops, priests, religious and laity, is characterized particularly by a strong affirmation of the presence of all Christians in the world. The terms used are such all-inclusive designations as "the followers of Christ," "Christians," "the People of God," "the Church." Prescinding from the question of non-Catholic Christians, the view of the Constitution is neither that of identifying the Church with the hierarchy, nor of affirming a presence in the world only for the laity. Its vision is more comprehensive. Underlying this vision is not only a specific ecclesiology, but an understanding of "the world" which demands that every Christian be present in it.

The Constitution opens with those magnificent lines:

> The joys and the hopes, the griefs and the anxieties of the men of this age, especially those who are poor or in any way afflicted, these too are the joys and hopes, the griefs and anxieties of the followers of Christ. Indeed, nothing genuinely human fails to raise an echo in their hearts. For theirs is a community composed of men. United in Christ, they are led by the Holy Spirit in their journey to the kingdom of their Father and they have welcomed the news of salvation which is meant for every man. That is why this community realizes that it is truly and intimately linked with mankind and its history.[3]

These lines establish the context for the whole document and lead into the following description of the world which underlies the Constitution's emphasis on the presence of every Christian in the world:

> Therefore, the Council focuses its attention on the world of men, the whole human family along with the sum of those realities in the midst of which that family lives. It gazes upon that world which is the theater of man's history, and carries the marks of his energies, his tragedies, and triumphs; that world which the Christian sees as created and sustained by its Maker's love, fallen indeed into the bondage of sin, yet emancipated now by Christ. He was crucified and rose again to break the stranglehold of personified Evil, so that this world might be fashioned anew according to God's design and reach its fulfillment.[4]

The world is not regarded as "out there" somewhere beyond the confines of the Church. The Constitution affirms what is becoming increasingly clear to Christians in general, that there is but one world, the world of humans, which is at the same time the theater of human history and of the unfolding of God's creative love for all people. It is in such an integral vision of the world that *Gaudium et Spes* seeks to delineate the active presence of the Church, and therefore, of Christians, amid humanity. Church and world are distinct, but not separate.

Addressing itself not only to Catholics nor even only to Christians, but, on behalf of the People of God, entering into conversation with every person on the problems facing all of humanity, the Council seeks to give proof of the solidarity of the Church "with the entire human family with which it is

bound up as well as its respect and love for that family."[5] The Council speaks from this vantage point when it states: "We must therefore recognize and understand the world in which we live, its expectations, its longings, and its often dramatic characteristics."[6] This people of God seeks to discern "authentic signs of God's presence and purpose in the happenings, needs and desires in which this People has a part along with other men of this age."[7] In seeking to respond to these realities and the questions they raise, "the People of God and the human race in whose midst it lives render service to each other."[8]

Expressing the function of this Constitution as complementary to that of *The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, the Council says it must now "consider this same Church inasmuch as she exists in the world, living and acting with it."[9] A few lines further on the Council develops this idea more fully:

> Thus the Church, at once a visible assembly and a spiritual community, goes forward together with humanity and experiences the same earthly lot which the world does. She serves as a leaven and as a kind of soul for human society as it is to be renewed in Christ and transformed into God's family.
>
> That the earthly and the heavenly city penetrate each other is a fact accessible to faith alone. It remains a mystery of human history, which sin will keep in great disarray until the splendor of God's sons is fully revealed.[10]

Part II of the Constitution is given over entirely to a detailed consideration of certain crucial problems in the world of today and the necessity for all Christians to be engaged in the solution of them. Finally, the Constitution concludes in a vein similar to its opening lines:

> Mindful of the Lord's saying: "By this will all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another" (Jn. 13: 35), Christians cannot yearn for anything more ardently than to serve the men of the modern world ever more generously and effectively. Therefore, holding faithfully to the gospel and benefiting from its resources, and united with every man who loves and practices justice, Christians have shouldered a gigantic task demanding fulfillment in this world. Concerning this task they must give a reckoning to Him who will judge every man on the last day.[11]

Being Christian only serves to deepen, not lessen, the urgency of this engagement in the world.

The Christian and the Development of Culture

"The Proper Development of Culture" (Part II, Chapter II) risks being passed over as simply an application of the doctrines of Part I to a restricted area of human activity. Its position in the text, sandwiched between marriage and socio-economic life, encourages such an oversight. The chapter did start as such a limited consideration, but it evolved into a presentation, in the final document, of the principles fundamental to Christian presence in all the areas treated in Part II. A proposal to move it to a more logical position was put forward too late. Even during the Council's deliberations however, Cardinal Lercaro described the chapter as "the key to the whole Constitution".[12]

According to this chapter, every human being, precisely as a human person and enjoying the dignity and responsibility of personhood, is immersed in the "given-ness" of created reality. This "given" is referred to in this chapter as "nature", not in the sense in which one speaks of "human nature" nor of "natural" as contrasted with "supernatural." Rather, it is what we discover on being born, as a given and a gift.

Confronted with such nature, humans come to recognize their cultural task, "to come to an authentic and full humanity only through culture, that is, through the cultivation of natural good and values. Wherever human life is involved, therefore, nature and culture are quite intimately connected."[13]

"Culture" is being used in a more fundamental sense than a refined appreciation of the arts, though this is included.

> The word "culture in its general sense indicates all those factors by which man refines and unfolds his manifold spiritual and bodily qualities. It means his effort to bring the world itself under his control by his knowledge and his labor. It includes the fact that by improving customs and institutions he renders social life more human both within the family and in the civic community. Finally, it is a feature of culture that throughout the course of time a man expresses, communicates, and conserves in his works great spiritual experiences and desires, so that these may be of advantage to the progress of many, even of the whole human family.[14]

The Council expresses its awareness of the increasing numbers of people who are conscious that they themselves are the artisans and authors of the culture of their community, and of a growing sense of human interdependence in promoting such development.

The Council Fathers see this responsibility rooted in one's very humanity and made even more urgent by one's Christian faith which provides "excellent incentives and helps toward discharging this duty more energetically and especially toward uncovering the full meaning of this activity, a meaning which gives human culture its eminent place in the integral vocation of man."[15]

Respect for the Autonomy of Created Reality

Consistent with this affirmation of the validity of a Christian's active participation in the cultural task confronting all of humanity, the Council Fathers express the need to respect the proper autonomy or independence of this reality. This need is expressed in contrast to two positions the Fathers consider as deviations from a proper understanding of temporal reality.

The Council rejects the view of the temporal which regards it as so lacking in its own proper value and inner consistency as to be absorbed into a relationship with God which effectively neutralizes the human being's presence and activity there and would thus "work against the independence (*autonomia*) of men, of societies, or of the sciences."[16] It is precisely such a view that many of our contemporaries fear, and with reason, for such rejection of it has not always been a strong point in the history of the Church.

On the other hand, the Council also rejects the view which, at least partially in reaction to the first extreme, totally isolates the temporal from God. Aware of the shortcomings sometimes found among Christians who do not sufficiently attend to the rightful automony of created reality, the Council affirms that a proper understanding of human activity does not necessarily lead to the Promethean struggle feared by many today.[17]

These two positions should not be seen as two poles, as though the Council has moved the Church along a continuum away from the pole of total control and closer to the pole of absolute autonomy. The conciliar position is not a middle ground or a compromise in a power struggle. This view would imply that it was still the Church which was somehow empowered to bestow or withdraw the autonomy of various sectors of created reality—somewhat like a benevolent dictator. It is just such a view which moderns rightly reject. But instead of a view of temporal reality as lacking in its own proper value and having such value only in being referred or offered to God, the Constitution here affirms that "created things and societies themselves enjoy their own laws and values which must be gradually deciphered, put to use, and regulated by men".[18] This approach is not only required by moderns but harmonizes with the will of the Creator. "For by the very circumstance of their having been created, all things are endowed with their own stability, truth, goodness, proper laws and order".[19] This does not mean that the Christian now confronts reality with no reference to God. Rather such a person is present to the world, acknowledging its creatureliness, but working with it and amidst it, respecting its proper laws and values, realizing that thus one is cooperating with God and referring reality to God its Creator. "For though the same God is Savior and Creator, Lord of human history as well as of salvation history, in the divine arrangement itself the rightful autonomy of the creature, and particularly of man, is not withdrawn. Rather it is re-established in its own dignity and strengthened in it."[20]

Thus the Christian in the world, by the very fact of being human and Christian, is called upon to respect the rightful autonomy of the process of human culture.[21]

APPLICATION TO CAMPUS MINISTRY AT A CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY

The conciliar perspective just developed seems to call for a view of a Catholic university as primarily exercising a deep commitment to the shared cultural task of higher education, a task carried out with full respect for the rightful autonomy of the inner processes and laws of higher education. Its "Catholic" character, though institutionally sanctioned by its constitution, would be effective in so far as there was actively present a "critical mass" of Catholic Christians—students, faculty, administrators, staff—committed to the promotion of this cultural task out of a Christian faith-life, numerous enough to effectively influence the ambience of the institution. This Catholic character of the university would be manifested not simply in its explicit religious functions, but especially in its effectively lived commitment to humanity, to justice and truth, with an obvious bias toward the oppressed, the powerless, the poor. Through theological reflection and instruction and through opportunities for explicitly Christian activities, the creative-redemptive action of God, operative throughout the whole educational process, could be brought to conscious awareness and celebrated by the Christian community.

Campus ministry in such a situation needs the freedom and support to carry out its share of this mission. Its task is comprised of two major elements. First, enabling Catholics (or Christians—the task is obviously ecumenical) to have the opportunity to internalize and develop their existence as Christians in the world even now, while engaged in this cultural task of education. Catholics particularly seem to need to learn that their responsive relationship with God and others in Christ is not developed elsewhere and then applied to their daily life, but such relationships develop within the very context of daily living. The tendency to identify one's spiritual development with explicit religious activities, equating the quality of Catholic living with the frequency of Catholic practices, needs to be challenged. The spiritual activities—liturgies, prayer groups, retreats, etc.—need to be presented not as havens where one leaves the world to be with God, but as spaces or zones where one can make explicit, bring to the surface, be re-attuned to the

presence and action of God in the midst of everyday life.

A second priority for campus ministry is the integration into one's Christian vision of the personal and global concerns of humanity as such. The shared responsibility for developing culture, as understood by the Council, is not a trick to win converts but is a position consistent with a Christian conviction that it is in the midst of human concerns of all people that one's Christian commitment is lived out. That this is a struggle against forces that dehumanize and exploit, and that this is a stance at once global and local should be obvious. Campus ministers need to provide opportunities or encourage others to provide them to raise consciousness and to help in dealing directly with these human needs. Sometimes such consciousness raising and action will need to be directed toward the dehumanizing elements present in the particular educational institution itself.

CONCLUSION

The approach to campus ministry at a Catholic university developed here is not new to many campus ministers and Catholic educators. Both have shared in the questioning, uncertainties, false starts and occasional successes of attempting to incarnate the Gospel vision of Christian presence that grew out of Vatican II. One hopes that this reflection on *Gaudium et Spes* will contribute to this on-going and challenging process.

FOOTNOTES

[1]The complete research is contained in an unpublished doctoral dissertation, *Responding to God in a Secularized World According to the Documents of Vatican II* (College St. Albert, Louvain, Belgium 1970) 245 pp. The experience has been as Director of Campus Ministry at University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara, Ca.

[2]"The Catholic University in the Modern World," para #43, published as Vol. XXXV, No. 3, (March 1973) NCEA *College Newsletter*.

[3]Vatican II, *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, no. 1. All citations of the Constitution are taken from *The Documents of Vatican II*, edited by Walter Abbott, S.J. and published by the Guild Press, the Association Press, and America Press (New York, 1966).

[4]*Ibid.*, no. 2. This descriptive definition of the world has definite normative value in the conciliar documents not only due to its presence in this Constitution, but also to its being the product of repeated formulations in response to the requests of numerous Council Fathers. Cf *Schema Constitutionis Pastoralis de Ecclesia in mundo hujus temporis: Textus et relationes* (Nov., 1965), Relatio ad Prooemium, ad. n. 2 (C)-(N), p. 8 (Henceforth cited as *Schema Nov. 1965*). Canon Charles Moeller, one of the principal authors of this document, in commenting on this text, notes that in the Latin the whole paragraph cited is one sentence with a single subject *"mundus"* ("world"), bringing out the unity of this one world as that for which Christ died and in which Christians, together with the rest of humanity, live and work. He also maintains that this definition should be considered normative for the whole document. Cf *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, ed. H. Vorgrimler (New York, Herder and Herder, 1967-69), vol. v, pp. 87-91.)

[5]*Ibid.*, no. 3. The clause "with which it is bound up" ("*cui inseritur*") was added in the November, 1965 preparatory schema "So as to better show the union (*coniunctio*) of the People of God with the world and to avoid an impression of distance or false condescension." *Schema Nov. 1965*. Relatio ad Prooemium, ad. n. 3(B), p. 8. The clause was later defended against the objection of one bishop who felt it too strong because the Church is in the world but not of it. The response again stated the desire of many bishops to emphasize the "intimate union (*coniunctio*) of the People of God with the world". *Schema Constitutionis Pastoralis de Ecclesia in mundo huius temporis: Textus et correctiones admissae necnon expensio modorum*, Partis Iae (1965), Modus 28 ad n. 3, p. 133.

[6]*Ibid.*, no. 4 Nos. 4-10 present this analysis.

[7]*Ibid.*, no. 11.

[8]*Ibid.*

[9]*Ibid.*, no. 40.

[10]*Ibid.*

[11]*Ibid.*, no. 93.

[12]*La Documentation Catholique*, 61 (Paris, 1964), col. 1662.

[13]*Gaudium et Spes*, no. 53. The final sentence was not added until the November, 1965 Schema. The *Relatio* explains: "The third emendation indicated the general object of the chapter, i.e., the connection between culture and nature, since the chapter deals not only with refined cultures, but with all human culture." *Schema Nov. 1965*. Relatio ad n. 57 (nunc 53), (C), p. 32. Msgr. Albert Dondeyne, one of the principal resource persons for this section, commenting on this paragraph, insists that culture is to be understood here in this very basic and universal sense. "Man only exists as man in manifesting and expressing himself in culture; or, putting it in another way, man humanizes himself only in humanizing nature" "L'essor de la culture," (Ch. II), *L'Eglise dans le monde de ce temps. Constitution pastorale "Gaudium et Spes"*, sous la direction de Y. M.-J. Congar et M. Peuchmaurd, Unam Sanctam, 65b, Tome II (Paris, 1967), pp. 460-461.

[14]*Ibid.*, no. 53. The term is definitely to be understood in an anthropological sense. *Schema Nov. 1965*, Relatio ad n. 57 (D), p. 32 Cf. also Dondeyne, *Op. cit.*, pp. 462-463.

[15]*Ibid.*, no. 57. Cf. nos. 33-39, and especially nos. 33-35 for a further development of the theology underlying this vocation.

[16]*Ibid.*, no. 36. This human autonomy can also be seen in the themes of human dignity and freedom in nos. 12-17, 24-32.

[17]*Ibid.*, no. 34. Cf. also nos. 7, 20, 21, 36, 41.

[18]*Ibid.*, no. 36.

[19]*Ibid.*

[20]*Ibid.*, no. 41. Cf. Gustave Thils, "L'activité humaine dans l'univers (Ire partie, chapitre III)," *Vatican II: L'Eglise dans le monde de ce temps: Constitution pastorale Gaudium et Spes*, ed. Congar et Peuchmaurd, 65b, Tome II (Paris, 1967), p. 291; Alfons Auer, *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, ed. H. Vorgrimler (New York, Herder and Herder, 1967-69), vol. V, p. 192.

[21]*Ibid.*, no. 59. The Relatio for the Nov. 1965 Schema notes the need to respect the autonomy of the development of culture. *Schema Nov. 1965*, Relatio ad n. 59, p. 34.

by
Rev. Daniel Germann, S.J.
Director of Campus Ministry
University of Santa Clara

Campus Minister and President: Partners in Service

The campus minister and president have more in common than they might realize. Just today a brochure crossed my desk describing "Fund-raising as ministry". Such an identification should make the president feel less mercenary and make both campus minister and president feel more like partners.

They both struggle with the tension between what they say they are doing and what others perceive they are doing. Some would say that both presidential reports and campus ministry mission statements are closer to fiction than fact. Campus ministry speaks of: "effective Christian presence", "building Christian Community", "education for Justice", "developing men and women for others", but lives with the reality that that presence is muted, that community beset with jealousies and tensions, the cries of injustice fall on deaf ears, and students remain overly introspective, if not selfish. The president, too, knows that assurances to parents and donors about the religious vitality of the campus are often an uneasy mixture of hopes and less-than-perfect realities.

What do we do? First, admit our problem, frankly and candidly as more and more of us are doing. Then accept a shared responsibility to move toward realistic, cooperative solutions. We have to leave behind defensive posture and rhetoric. On a church-related campus at least, I would emphasize that campus ministry is the work and mission of everyone. If the campus minister is to avoid being the scapegoat for an ineffective program, he or she must be able to encourage and further collaborative efforts.

I try to stress on our campus that each of us, faculty, students, administrators and staff have the opportunity, if not the responsibility, to promote the growth of one another in creating an atmosphere wherein each person can freely become his/her best self. Within this context, campus ministry is a service by all for the growth of all.

Too many campus ministry programs seem to be removed from the mainstream of campus life. This may be the result of a person's theology and style, historical factors, or organizational problems. In large universities it is more difficult to become intimately involved, but on a small campus it should be possible for the campus minister to be a catalyst, a facilitator and leader. The effectiveness of any campus ministry program would then be measured by the extent to which it is integrated into the total life of the college or university and able to enlist and involve the talents of as many as possible. The life of a resident religious community, the work of the campus counseling center, faculty advising, residence hall programming—all are forms of campus ministry in the broad sense of promoting growth. The campus minister has to be at home with and successful in coordinating his/her activities with all of these components of college and university life.

Very importantly, the campus minister has to play a role, directly or indirectly, in the academic life of the campus, helping colleagues ask the larger, deeper questions, suggesting interdisciplinary dimensions and probing ethical issues. The campus minister should also be able to deal with administrators on a respected and highly qualified peer basis.

Today we are being told that admissions and development are college-wide responsibilities, and they are. But even more so should the energizing of faith, hope and love on campus be the work of us all. What are some of the obstacles to this spirit of collaboration and cooperation and what are some of the special opportunities open to us?

Obstacles

One obvious obstacle to effective collaboration is the stereotyping we do of one another. The campus minister is the spiritual guru, not very practical, one-or-two issue person. Campus ministry is liturgy, personal counseling, and periodic requests for involvement in needy causes. On the other hand, the president is too business-oriented, not sufficiently sensitive to important value questions, at best too distracted to really care about the religious life on campus. (One of my first experiences as president was the surprise of some that I really liked to celebrate liturgy, to probe ethical questions, etc). We have to break down these stereotypes, encourage one another in our mutual work of ministry, and complement our strengths and weaknesses.

Closely related to personal stereotyping is the compartmentalizing that occurs, even on a small campus. Authentic respect for healthy autonomy and distinction of roles too often degenerates into a jealous defense of one's turf, or at least a lack of interest in what someone else is doing. We need to experiment more with organizational patterns and

group dynamics, but even more fundamentally, we need more interest (not meddling) in one another's work, more openness and trust, if a collaborative campus ministry is to be possible.

Another serious obstacle is suggested by the haunting lyric from the musical "1776": "Is anybody there? Does anybody care"? To many on the academic scene today, even in church-related colleges, campus ministry, at least in its more conventional form, does not have much to say. Obviously, blame and reasons for this are multiple, but the situation does highlight the problem of winning credibility and being heard through various forms of pre-evangelization.

Finally, campus ministry has to overcome the image of being cosmetically added to a basically secular operation as a trade-off to soothe uneasy parents or conservative donors - rather than a vibrant force making a difference within the entire academic community. I have not mentioned the problem of effectively funding campus ministry. If the president is serious about such ministry he or she has to provide adequate funding, and the campus minister has a right to stress that accountability. A sense of partnership is again important. A program has to be adequately funded, but first it must be carefully articulated and planned.

Opportunities

On the more positive side, collaborative and cooperative campus ministry is challenged by new opportunities. Religious orders and congregations today are seeking greater clarity in the apostolic dimension of their college and university work. This search, coupled with spiritual renewal, should make for a stronger religious presence on campus. Certainly a revitalized religious community strengthens the campus ministry effort.

Increasingly, more widespread and more effective religious-lay and clerical-lay collaborative efforts are another most important opportunity for cooperative campus ministry. Part of this course is a growing awareness of every Christian's participation in the ministry.

The quest and need for holistic and interdisciplinary approaches to contemporary problems and the often-articulated search of the group to "put it all together" make a cooperative ministry more attractive and necessary. The campus minister cannot possibly speak to the ethical dimensions of biomedical questions, environmental problems, the economic issues of land use, resource allocation, world hunger, etc., without help from faculty colleagues.

There is a new and growing interest in questions of values, even where once "value-free" was a badge of honor and courage. Education for social awareness and responsibility, education for justice, education in the service of faith, are no longer strategies easily dismissed as unsuited to the academic enterprise. We are far from clear on what we are talking about in these areas, but at least we are talking - and in some cases acting constructively. Campus ministry should obviously be at the creative center of these movements.

Young men and women are searching for a sense of their own worth and are more open to a campus ministry which celebrates that worth and helps to heal the many wounds of fear and uncertainty. Movements toward spiritual renewal and toward the experiences of community are also opportunities to be seized upon in effective campus ministry today. Certainly we need more deep-minded men and women grounded in solid spirituality, and certainly we need to develop person-in-community as an antidote to the selfishness and selfcenteredness around and within us. Hope is present in both directions in current spiritual movements, but personal spiritual renewal has to open outwards, and the experience of community has to be energizing, not debilitating.

Conclusion

These reflections have attempted to be practical, not theoretical, and they are far from comprehensive. It is obvious to us all that campus ministry is and must be highly specific for each campus. Each program has to create its own synthesis of prayer, liturgy, counseling, involvement, action, prophetic challenge and community building. The burden of this paper is simply that, whatever the particular synthesis of possibilities, we need collaboration between the campus minister and the president, and among as many segments of the campus community as we can muster. I am advocating an activist highly involved model because I believe that is a corollary of our belief in the Incarnation and Resurrection. I am advocating a cooperative model because of the need we all have for support in our faith–in its development, strengthening and translation into action, especially in a highly interdependent world.

Private college presidents discuss many survival strategies these days. None is more important than a strategy for a collaborative campus ministry because the depth, vitality and practice of faith on our campuses is our best reason for survival.

Rev. Charles L. Currie, S.J.
President, Wheeling College

Lay Ministry on a Catholic Campus

A NEW MODEL FOR MINISTRY

"You do what for a living?" repeated the gentleman sitting next to me on the airplane.

"I am an Associate Chaplain."

"But I thought all Chaplains were priests. Have you ever been in the military?"

"No. In fact, no to both points. All Catholic Chaplains are not necessarily priests, nor have they been in the military."

We settled back with our coffee for the next half hour and I proceeded to elucidate on the fact that I am indeed doing ministry on a Jesuit University Campus as a full-time member of the staff. I have actually been involved in creating this position over the last six years. All the regular questions follow: Are you a nun? How did you get into this field? What do you actually do? Well, what kind of training do you have for the position? . . . And on and on . . . .

It takes a great deal of energy to be continuously explaining and even justifying oneself in a Church and culture that do not have many models for ministry other than that of vowed religious women and men and ordained men. In the six years that I have been involved in campus ministry, the number of lay persons on other campuses has grown considerably. The Task Force on Lay Ministry for the Catholic Campus Ministry Association has discovered 135 lay persons across the country involved with part of full time campus ministry. A large portion of these persons are on Catholic campuses. It is not unusual to find more than one lay person on a given staff.

Several factors are contributing to the increasing number of lay ministers. Catholic Colleges are reflecting their priority of religious development for their campuses by increasing their budgets for campus ministry enabling larger and more diverse staffs. As a partial response to Vatican II, the talents of lay people have been realized and are now being tapped. But dioceses, in general, have not yet placed the same priority on the development of campus ministry personnel. Nor have dioceses wholeheartedly committed themselves to the use of lay ministers.

Lay persons on a public campus are involved in many of the same activities and experience the same joys and pains as their brothers and sisters on the Catholic campus. Yet, sometimes working with ecumenical staffs or Catholic Centers they have different support systems and identity struggles. A lay person is more of an oddity on a Catholic campus where the model for ministry has traditionally been the ordained male. Public campuses have usually experienced a diversity of models for ministry. The stereotype of "Chaplain" on the Catholic campus is one that has to be expanded. The presence of lay ministers and religious women is helping to do this, but not always without resistance from the hierarchy and the campus community itself.

My personal ministry has been on a Catholic campus. However, in recent years I have had contact with many campus ministers in other settings. My comments, although written primarily from my vantage point, do not necessarily exclude lay persons in other settings. Nor can they be entirely representative of them. There are also many elements that are common to all women involved in campus ministry whether they are lay or religiously vowed. Finally, some of the pitfalls of campus ministry are characteristic of anyone involved in ministerial work.

FUNCTION AND STATUS

In attempting to define the parameters of lay ministries we have to look at a diversity of functions as well as status. Sometimes job titles are a clue to the role a person fulfills on a given staff. The term lay minister spans the gamut from the volunteer peer minister to the professionally paid full-time staff member. I will focus on the lay ministry that is paid, full-time, professional in status, and collegial in function. This is not to say that the bulk of lay peoples' positions are defined this way, but I think it is the growing edge of campus ministry. It is this type of ministry that has implications and promise for the future and for the Church.

To clarify: when I refer to lay ministry, I mean the same title, status, salary and job description as would apply to an ordained clergy person in the same situation. Title, status, salary and job description will vary from one administrative structure to the next. Yet, designating everyone on the staff as "Campus Minister", "Chaplain", or "Associate Chaplain" with differing job descriptions suggests a new model for ministry. I think that limiting the job function by the job title pigeon-holes the lay person into a more restrictive style or form of ministry. The individual may actually be free to respond creatively to various needs within the given community, but I

find it important for the staff and larger community to recognize and affirm this creative response rather than accept it as an accidental development. This model differs significantly from the one in which the priest is hired to do "campus ministry" and the lay person is responsible for music, program direction, etc. A subtle, functional difference, yet very real distinction. I think it is the position of the "Campus Minister" in the fullest, freest sense of the words that most lay people seek.

WHAT DO YOU DO?

Having distinguished and defined professional lay ministry, the question remains, "What on earth do you do!?!" Lay ministers are involved in all activities that are a part of campus ministry: retreats, counseling, liturgies, programming, teaching, scheduling, publicity, preaching, writing, social action, spiritual direction, administration, prayer and music. We respond in many ways to the needs of the communities and institutions in which we are ministering. In some instances we can only be a Christian presence. In other instances, a lay minister gives campus ministry a unique understanding to influence institutional policies. Campus ministry can thus challenge the administration in new ways, i.e., women's issues, child care, alternative lifestyles.

As I reflected on what it is to be a lay minister on a campus, a friend asked, "What would a typical work day look like?" Thumbing through the last 14 months in my datebook affirmed that there was no such thing as "a typical day", let alone week. So I sketched a day that is somewhere in between typical and ideal. One reason I would label it ideal is that most days are neither predictable nor orderly - the built-in excitement and frustration of campus ministry.

A "typical" day might include:

1) two or three conversations/sessions with students (everything from personal counseling to information for class projects.);
2) several letters to people on campus and off;
3) one planning meeting (at least) for a coming retreat or event (usually in the late afternoon or evening);
4) several phone calls on a variety of subjects (scheduling retreat houses, finding films, speakers, talking to a distressed parent, describing my position to someone interested in becoming a Campus Minister, etc.);
5) lunch either in the student dining room; Jesuit Residence, Faculty Club, or not at all;
6) classes, reading or the unending stack of "paperwork";
7) and all the crazy little things that come up in between . . .

But still, the action and statements are only a part of the job description. An individual's own faith commitment, spiritual journey, and life calling are not easily captured.

LESSONS AND SPECIAL PROBLEMS

A difficult and yet challenging lesson I learned early was that if I did not take myself seriously as a minister no one else would! This meant coming to grips with a "calling" to ministry for which there are few models. Another major lesson I learned was the juxtaposition of taking myself seriously, yet not becoming "too serious." To be on the growing edge of the Church's ministry demands the ultimate in a sense of humor. The joys and the struggles are side by side and sometimes the smiles and tears are indistinguishable. Clearly, the presence of fine colleagues is an essential help and support in defining the role of a lay campus minister. And still, there is always the sense of alone-ness as one makes one's own ministerial choices. Yet, there is a model for that radical alone-ness in responding to God's call - Jesus.

Lay persons are too new in this ministry for their positions to have come easily or have been well defined. All of Christian ministry demands a willingness to wander in the wilderness, yet this is even lonelier at times for the professional laity because they lack the same support systems which may be available to the religious or the ordained. This support is as concrete as economic resources or as vague as possibilities for cultural and educational development. Nor is it automatic for the lay campus minister to have the social and spiritual support experienced by their non-lay sisters and brothers in campus ministry. It is natural for a community to see a priest or nun as someone to be invited in or over as the case may be. There is not necessarily the same outreach for the single lay minister and it becomes even more ambiguous if the person is married.

PARTICULAR GIFTS FOR THE COMMUNITY

It is out of this struggle for self definition that the lay minister brings her/his gifts to the campus ministry. Lay ministers struggle with Christian commitment while dealing with everyday problems of human existence. There is no living space, maid service, common dining room, or secluded retreat spot provided for lay campus ministers as there is for some religious and/or ordained persons working in campus ministry. There is not necessarily a reality gap between the lifestyles of the lay minister and that of the people to whom they minister as there

may be for some non-lay people. Lay ministers have the same questions about lifestyle, interpersonal relationships, sexuality, family life and job security as faculty, staff and students. In and through everyday life experience, lay ministers proclaim and witness to the message of Jesus in a way that priests, brothers, and sisters cannot.

Lay ministers incarnate the challenge to minister given every Christian in Baptism and Confirmation. When we take seriously the Pauline notion of the diversity of gifts, then we are all called to share our gifts with the Christian community. Our narrow models for ministry, ordained male or vowed religious, have limited the ministry of the laity. Such models support hierarchical structures and confine the laity's involvement to the service of the institution. The lay minister's very presence challenges the laity to recognize their gifts and to minister to the needs they encounter regardless of lifestyle and vocational choices. All God's people are called to a life of love and service.

On those Catholic residential campuses where students continue to live in an atmosphere of "being taken care of by the institution", the lay campus minister is another type of challenge. He or she is not such a part of the system. The lay minister has a life apart from the campus. In many ways this makes the lay person more real to the students. College years are those in which young adults question past values and authorities. It may be easier for some students to clarify their value systems with someone more like themselves, rather than with one who appears to have made a traditional religious commitment. The stereotypic priest with all the answers may not appear as helpful as the more ambiguous figure of the lay minister who presents a questioning image.

A HELPFUL DIVERSITY FOR THE CHURCH

Along with all the "built-in attractiveness" of the lay minister, let us not ignore them as individuals. No generalities encompass all lay campus ministers. No two have had the same training or life experiences prior to their current positions. There are no novitiates or seminaries for lay ministers. Even the formal campus ministry educational programs are not necessarily geared for lay people. Programs are developing and have been developed. Many of us "designed" our own training, education and spiritual development. Such individuality has advantages and disadvantages. Some lay campus ministers have left the priesthood or religious life. Some are graduates of Catholic Colleges and Universities. Some have actively sought ministry and others have fallen into it. The great diversity of paths travelled is part of the unique spirit lay ministers give to ministry and the Church.

Future leadership for the Church is being developed on our Catholic campuses. I think lay ministries in these settings will have an important impact for the rest of the Church. As a lay campus minister and a woman in ministry I am reminded almost daily of the role model that I become for students. Freshman religious studies majors decide they want my job. As more models are developed for Christians to carry out their baptismal commitment as a professional minister how will the Church respond? Will the students who have experienced the gifts of lay ministry on the campus and who are called to participate in the ministry, be welcomed in current structures?

My present experience tells me that there are many more lay people called to the ministry than there are ministerial positions. Current college students are not making commitments to the ordained or religious lifestyle as they did twenty years ago. Our seminaries and novitiates clearly indicate this trend. Yet, I do not feel that young adults have any less interest in serving others and witnessing to the Gospel. The current lay ministries in all their variety are challenges to the Church to develop new models for ministry with the people of God. Will dioceses and parishes accept, enable, and affirm as well as support lay ministries in the near future? Will these same bodies see the ordained sacramental ministry as just one of many ministries? Today's college students and lay ministers are challenging the Church to take seriously the promise of a diversity of lifestyles as well as a diversity of ministries.

THE CURRENT DILEMMA

The question that best captures the current dilemma facing the Church is: Can you really have shared ministry in a hierarchical Church? The best teams are those that are able to overcome or in fact give up hierarchy as *the* model for the Church. Vatican II of course emphasized the model of "people of God," but horizontal models of ministry are rarely evident. The campuses are one place where new forms of shared ministry are emerging. The success of these new forms of ministry usually depends on the willingness of the priest director to surrender his authority and to enable the ministry of others. Can he allow others decision-making power? Are women and lay people his equals?

Collegialty creates team ministry. Anything less is probably a group of "Lone Rangers" which of course is one legitimate way of functioning. The lay person and the woman in ministry usually need the resources of a team to enable and support their ministry. One of the lessons to be learned from lay persons doing effective ministries is that team and shared ministries are a more complete and honest witness to the Gospel for the college community.

In closing, the challenges and questions of lay ministry are complex. The path and directions for the future are open-ended. I, for one, would have it no other way.

by
Jennifer Konecny
Associate Chaplain
University of Santa Clara

Campus Ministry in a Small Institution: A Model

"Life is something that happens when you have made other plans."

—Jean Hilton (Secretary to Brother Charles B. Quinn, C.F.C., Executive Vice-President of Iona College)

WHAT WAS PLANNED AND WHAT HAPPENED

At the Iona Campus Ministry we've contributed our fair share of paper to master plans, budget reports, periodic reports to the Vice-President and the President, minutes of meetings, descriptions of projects completed and projects delayed, inter-office memos and poems, projections, evaluations, schemes and designs. But the real life of our campus ministry is not all in our plans; it is also in the "something that happens" as long as we don't let our plans get in the way. We feel it is an essential religious task to pay attention both to what we plan and to what happens. There is something of God in them both as well as in the connection between them.

Some examples will illustrate our experience. We invited Rabbi Moishe Davidowitz from the Speech Department to present a lecture he had prepared on "The Cross and the Tao" to a joint meeting of the Religious Studies Department and the Campus Ministry Staff. As planned, we learned about Eastern and Western religious symbol systems, their similarities, contrasts and possible synergies. What also "happened" was that the Rabbi expressed some of his feelings about being a Jew in a Catholic institution, surrounded by Christians who speak about elements of his religious heritage from a Christian bias. Moreover, the Rabbi heard, I think for the first time, Christians lamenting their own churches' lack of appreciation for their own mystical treasures.

A second example may be seen in a meeting we called of the various non-academic service personnel: Dean of Students, Assistant Dean of Students, Director of Special Services, School Nurse, Director of Residence, Members of the Counseling and Placement Staff, Director of Campus Security, Director of the Graduate Division's Pastoral Counseling Center, and the Campus Ministry Team. What we planned and did was to discuss procedures for crisis intervention in potentially dangerous psychological cases. What also "happened" was a building of a new and deeper level of trust among the people there for one another and an appreciation for the quality of services we are jointly providing on campus.

A third example started in the small circle of the ministry staff, which then consisted of "senior staff" members: Theresa McQuaid, Brother Edward Walsh, Father John Wilkinson and myself, and "student staff" members: Susan Mea, Teri Fleishman, Joe Pirrone and Maddalena Ferraro. One day Maddalena complained that she wanted to do some "ministering" and not just answer the phone. We asked her to bring up the matter at the weekly staff meeting. There Maddalena explained that she wanted to work particularly with students who were having trouble dealing with their parents. We encouraged her to go ahead and decided we would find other ways to make sure the phone got answered. That was what we planned and did.

What also happened came out of further work on our part as well as fortuitous events well beyond our power to control or even assay. Brother Walsh asked the question whether we were unreflectively copying the model of many institutions with a stratified structure. Even the campus ministry building had Upstairs offices for "senior staff" and the Downstairs area where the "student staff" bore the brunt of the work with the walk-in clientele. After much discussion, the whole staff agreed to begin destratifying by adopting the principle that division of labor, wherever possible, would be based on choice rather than position. This meant, for example, that it would not do for "top" people to sit back and have ideas which "bottom" people would be instructed to carry out; rather, anyone with an idea for a project would share the idea and take responsibility for seeing it through with whatever support freely emerged from the others. We had begun to develop a new structure within which we could be and operate

more convivially. Then, other space needs on campus dictated a move out of the building we were in; we found one large room near the Dean of Students' Office, where we were no longer stratified architecturally. About the same time, budget cuts prompted Brother Walsh to resign from the ministry staff to help save as many of the others' jobs as possible; he applied for the post of Dean of Students, which was then opening up. He got the job and began to restructure that operation the way we had the campus ministry. As we look back we can see what we could not forsee: some kind of circuitous connection between the respectful attention paid to Maddalena's complaint about answering the phone and the eventual "take-over" of the Dean of Students' Office.

We are beginning to surmise that the structure that is emerging is a whole *network* of circuitous connections between people and events, between the planned and the fortuitous, between our doing and not-doing. The essence of these connections is the religious reality of *relationship*. We have so far identified five important components of the kind of relationship we are experiencing: 1) Trust 2) Respect 3) Attention 4) Reflection 5) Non-Coerciveness.

PRINCIPLES OF OPERATION

With the centrality of this kind of relationship in mind we have developed an ever-provisional set of operation principles for the Iona Campus Ministry:

1. The major objective of campus ministry at Iona is to help the people here, including ourselves, explore and share the meaning in our lives, which, we are convinced, is essentially religious. Since Iona is known as a religiously oriented school, a large number of people who work or are students here are concerned about religious experience and values and want to share their concern in a personally valid way.

2. We are trying to encourage one another to discover and cherish the meaning in our lives by becoming aware of the bond between our own experience (individual and social) and the larger universal themes and images found in all the great religious traditions of humanity—with a particular, but not exclusive, emphasis upon their expression in the Roman Catholic tradition that is Iona's heritage from the Christian Brothers.

3. We are not trying to sell religion. We believe in working with nuclei of people in an increasingly campus-wide network who want to explore and share. Our faith and experience is that genuine religious community grows organically under these conditions.

4. Ministry does not exist to control people but to help them experience the depth of their own power in their own lives. We are not so much interested in having large numbers of people identify with campus ministry as we are in helping to generate a flow of relational energy around the campus which creates a prevailing tone of participation in a larger adventure of meaningful life.

5. We work with people who want to work with us and with whom we can work. We do not try to coerce anyone to our point of view or interfere with an approach that is different from ours. Neither do we lend our support to anything that would betray our convictions.

6. Reliance on "outside experts" is to be avoided wherever possible. We are developing a grassroots, self-sustaining process that encourages people to develop their own power rather than to react as objects of the power of others. This involves encouraging a properly limited view of people in archetypal power roles—including professionally religious people.

7. In complex institutions like this school there are no villains and no heroes. There are structures which hinder the flow of life and structures which encourage it. Life-encouraging structures are created by people who themselves feel encouraged by the flow of relational energy into their lives.

8. Management, accounting, and production-oriented models of operation are useful tools for certain aspects of running a religious school; but there also has to be a consciously shared recognition that other aspects need to be dealt with according to religious and educational models. One such model is that of a *relationship* of attentive, trustful mutuality anchored in the experience of Otherness.

9. Creative relationships bear fruit in creative work, which bears fruit in further creative relationships.

10. Relational energy, when recognized as valuable and fruitful, is available in great quantities and is self-intensifying and self-extending.

In summary, we feel we have a realistically contemplative approach to campus ministry in that we are trying to attend to what's there: in us, among us, around us and beyond us. It is a low-cost, high-yield approach because it calls upon available energy of many people of good will around the campus and beyond it. It concentrates on the relationship of people to one another and to events. A whole network of such creative relationships extends the flow of energy. Other such networks interface and spin off like Fibonacci spirals in all directions, helping to create an atmosphere charged with positive energy, which may be another term for grace.

by
Rev. James D. Poisson, O.S.C.
Coordinator, Campus Ministry
Iona College, New Rochelle, N.Y.

Campus Ministry to and by Faculty Members

INTRODUCTION

Clearly the spiritual ministry on a college campus can not simply be assigned to a team of specialists, by-passing (and exonerating!) administration, faculty, staff and students, as far as the tasks of ministering to one another are concerned. But a college or university is in some ways unlike all other institutions in the possibilities offered and the limitations proper to the situation. More particularly, it is the role of the faculty that is peculiar to the college campus.

TENSION IN OUR CHANGING SITUATION

Traditionally the task of a university or college is the pursuit of wisdom in the many dimensions of human knowledge, understanding and expression, not excluding the practical arts of healing, governing, building, and so on. There is a perennial tension in the role of the faculty between that kind of detachment from particular values and traditions that is open to serious study of alternate systems, and that kind of serious personal acceptance of a coherent pattern of values and traditions that can ground a genuine quest for wisdom. A pluralistic situation such as ours at Georgetown does not make the tension any easier to handle. It is no news that many faculty members deal with it by compartmentalizing – a coherent set of personal values and convictions operates in some areas of their personal lives but remains a well guarded secret, excluded from their teaching and other campus activities.

This kind of stance seems to many to be demanded by requirements of academic objectivity and respect for the consciences and religious freedom of students and colleagues. In fact, however, it often leads to impersonal and strained relationships and is in fact an inauthentic and alienating mode of existence. There are fads and fashions, which dictate this type of stance, that need to be unmasked. At the present stage of ecumenism we have high respect for what is different and what is a minority position. A few, for example, can punctiliously observe *kashrut*, festivals and other ritual requirements, and be respected for it; a Buddhist can wear special garb, insist on a vegetarian diet and meditate in the college quadrangle, and it will pose no problems; followers of new sects can chant and beat drums and proselytize without arousing serious concern; but Catholic observances or manifestations tend to arouse some anxiety and sense of shame – and this more especially on traditionally and professedly Catholic campuses.

There are reasons for this. We are at a crossroads in the shaping of our tradition. We have seen rapid and far-reaching changes in our generation, and there is a certain sense of insecurity and of disowning the past because we are ashamed and embarrassed by it. College faculties are particularly vulnerable to the consequent anxiety, because they are professionally required to be sophisticated, up to date, well informed, broadly knowledgeable. Because of the rapid changes facilitated by the Second Vatican Council, Catholic faculties are in a peculiarly insoluble dilemma. Many whose fields are not closely related to theology are uneasily aware that the patterns they learned long ago are outdated and that they are not familiar with the new patterns. Some are openly hostile to the Church that seems to have made fools of them. They may ridicule positions that in fact are no longer held, as though they were current and real problems. They may desperately try to align themselves with "the renewal" while understanding little of what is at stake. They may follow the patterns they learned in their youth, either quietly keeping their convictions private and trying to operate neutrally on campus, or in noisy protest over the vandalizing of the tradition.

WHAT TYPE OF MINISTRY IS NEEDED?

Alternatively to all these inauthentic responses, faculty members may seek to inform themselves in depth and to participate in the shaping of new patterns. But this requires certain specific types of support, that is, certain types of ministry. Clearly it requires a continuing intellectual formation. There will always be some faculty members willing and eager to participate in serious reading and discussion to bring their understanding of the Catholic position up to date in matters doctrinal, moral, liturgical and so on. Certainly it is very helpful if members of the Campus Ministry team can facilitate this by hosting the groups, providing leadership to the discussion, bibliography if it is not forthcoming from the faculty themselves, and stimulus to the process if it does not arise spontaneously. Similarly, some faculty members will come gratefully and enthusiastically to lecture series to update their understanding

of scripture interpretation, doctrinal understandings and so on. Small numbers had best not be a deterrent to the continuance of such opportunities. In order to have an emerging and continuing leadership on a campus, it seems to be much more important that this process be going on than that it have large participation.

THE LEADERSHIP OF THE FACULTY

The emergence of such leadership among faculty members and its continuance does seem important, because faculty can have an impact that no one else can have. This is obviously true in the classroom situation, for there the balance between detachment and personal, coherent stance is a delicate one, and it can only be maintained by persons confident of their own understanding and integration. But it is also true of the corporate character of the institution, in which faculty form a basic constitutive factor—one which is needed in achieving a certain visibly and publicly identifiable expression of the tradition and goals of the institution.

In both these contexts—that of the classroom and that of the institution as a whole—most Catholic colleges and universities are now suffering an identity crisis. We have come from an authoritarian style that demanded conformity of all, and we have swung into a permissive and non-committal style that tends to disallow any testimony of values and convictions. What seems to be called for is a style between these two. It is a style of corporate witness which is earnest but not authoritarian, which is highly visible and enthusiastic but does not demand conformity of others.

Worship is an important corporate activity for any community, and the college community is not an exception. The ministry of the faculty to the worshipping community is principally to participate in it visibly. Again, it seems not to be a matter of numbers but of visible and serious representation. If faculty members are able to contribute services as celebrants, planners, readers, musicians and so forth, this may be helpful, but it is their presence as worshippers in the college community that seems to be more significant than any particular contribution or function within the liturgy.

It is not only in the public worship but in the public morality and in the public social impact of the institution that its Christian and Catholic character is concretely expressed. Here the faculty has a crucial role, not only in the way they conduct themselves, individually and in departments and committees, but also in the critical and reflective functions they do or do not assume. In a pluralistic society like ours, the pressure on institutions to conform to the generally prevailing values of the society without critical reflection can be very strong. Unexamined assumptions often govern hiring, promotion, curriculum construction, graduation requirements, examination and evaluation systems, priorities among programs and departments. A keenly committed group of faculty, seriously reflecting on these assumptions and priorities in the light of the Christian character of the university, can perform an important ministry to the institution as a whole and to their colleagues, including those who do not share their faith and will not know the values and goals of the institution if they are not made explicit.

CONCLUSION

Many faculty members, whether or not they are ready and willing to shoulder the responsibility of a Christian ministry to others within the institution, have deep and readily acknowledged needs for a ministry to themselves of a traditional type, for which they would like to look to the campus ministry team (and indeed often can and do so look). Because of their relative sophistication they often find that parish sermons do not offer them enough depth and guidance. They appreciate a more challenging kind of preaching. Many would appreciate traditional preached retreats or directed retreats that seriously challenge personal growth, promoting the integration of values and understanding at the intellectual level that is demanded of them. Many would appreciate regular spiritual direction within the context of the Sacrament of Reconciliation, and for various reasons cannot find it in their parishes. In all these matters it would seem that there are many more who feel the need than there are those who come forward actively seeking the service. There appears to be a hesitancy that can be overcome by discreet advertising.

Certainly, on most campuses there are faculty members ready to participate very fully, both passively and actively, in the Christian vocation of the institution. Usually they need to be invited, and their coming together and becoming visible and known to one another needs to be facilitated. In that way, their role will be developed and strengthened within the context of "campus ministry."

by
Monika K. Hellwig
Associate Professor of Theology
Georgetown University

Jewish-Christian Ecumenical Activity on Campus

INTRODUCTION

In recent years most departments of Theology or Religious Studies in Catholic colleges and universities have offered courses in the religious traditions of various Protestant denominations, in Judaism and in the religions of the East as well. These offerings serve important intellectual needs of the ecumenical movement and promote mutual understanding among students of the various traditions. Such activity is the proper sphere of academic departments. It is well known, also, that much of scholarly theological publication is ecumenical in nature; a Catholic teacher of scripture, for example, would certainly rely on some Protestant biblical scholars no matter what or whom he was teaching.

There is another area of ecumenical concern, however, which properly falls outside the academic work of the teacher and within the scope and responsibility of the pastoral team on the campus. That area is the lived, experiential ecumenism among students, faculty and staff. If this most important religious movement of our time is to grow, both theological work *and* personal ecumenical development must go hand in hand. It is upon activities in this second area that this article attempts to comment.

Most Catholic colleges and universities today have student bodies and faculties that are religiously pluralistic, made up of Roman Catholics, Protestants of various denominations and Jews. Although the number of non-Catholics may not be large in some institutions, most schools attempt to serve the religious needs of their people no matter what their religious tradition. In schools with small non-Catholic populations usually this is done through the adjunct services of local clergy.

Great strides have been made theologically in the ecumenical dialogue between the various main line Christian denominations, advances of such significance that the principal difficulties now seem to be those of grass roots acceptance and institutional decisions rather than insuperable doctrinal differences. Granted that full Christian unity may still be a long way off one can feel a confidence in the air that it will come, that it can be worked out. Already many Christians of different denominations find it relatively easy to work, study, pray and publicly worship together. Once ecumenical Eucharistic celebrations are permitted many will be able to move immediately and comfortably into this central act together.

The much more difficult ecumenical area (and in this author's estimation, the most critical one facing us today) is the dialogue between Christians and Jews.[1] Here, compared with the intra-Christian ecumenical movement, the search for a religious unity encounters much more serious difficulties, both on the theological and doctrinal levels and on the grass roots level of understanding and acceptance. I will not deal here with the central theological approaches being made, but rather with some pastoral activity that has been attempted by chaplains in campus ministry.

This article is written by a Catholic Christian and hence from his perspective, but it has been influenced by consultation with Jewish and other Christian chaplains who have shared much of the author's experience. The experience includes several years of close cooperation in ministerial activities with the other chaplains mentioned above. Recently this group attended a conference on Jewish-Christian relations sponsored by the National Institute for Campus Ministries. Reference to this meeting is made below.

THE BEGINNING OF DIALOGUE

The essential first ingredient and a singularly difficult one to come by for Jewish and Christian partners in dialogue is the development of mutual trust. The history of Jewish-Christian relations over two thousand years is an almost unrelieved burden and block to such trust. The Jewish partner will usually be the most hesitant, and justifiably so. The experience of being Jewish in the western world of the last fifty years seeks in vain to find even distant analogue in any Christian's experience during that same period.

In addition, the experience of being threatened with extinction as a people and as a religion at the hands of an, at least, nominally Christian people is so central and so recent in Jewish consciousness that one marvels that there can be any dialogue at all. Yes, extinction by annihilation is one source of fear; an equally important, though less violent, source of fear is extinction through assimilation. The ability to establish a basic trust between dialogue partners will vary, of course, depending on the personalities involved. Usually, for the Jew, it will mean at least a tacit renunciation by the Christian of any desire to proselytize, and for the Christian, a willingness on the part of the Jew to allow the subject of Jesus to enter the conversation.

BIBLE STUDY AND SPIRITUAL HISTORIES

If this basic trust can be established, a very fruitful early activity seems to be some form of common Bible study. At the NICM conference mentioned above two sessions of Bible study were held for the thirty-three participants from nine campuses. The first session, which was conducted in three small groups, followed several Jewish methods of study: after a public reading of the text, a discussion of rabbinic commentaries to uncover the "simple meaning" of the passage; a discussion based on contemporary commentaries by people like Buber, Kierkegaard and Erich Fromm; a discussion of the personal meaning the text had for those in the study group. The second session, using the same text (which was the Genesis account of the sacrifice of Isaac), followed methods usually employed by Christians, including an historico-critical approach and a personal response to the text by those in the group.

Bible study for the Jew is a form of prayer not meditational prayer but discursive, dialogical, sometimes polemical prayer. The discussions, in addition to bringing to light our thoughts and feelings about various central religious problems evoked by the text under study, also sometimes left the group in a contemplative state for moments at a time. There was lively interest generated in this particular aspect of one another's tradition. It was interesting for Christians to note that much of the rabbinical commentary had the flavor of what they would call a homiletic approach, one with which some felt quite familiar.

Another activity that has been entered into by Christians and Jews in dialogue has been the recounting for each other of one's personal spiritual history. In such a recounting a person tells, in a sense, the history of their life with particular emphasis on those moments or situations where they feel God was influencing them. This narration can include what one's image of God is, how one prays, what led them to make important decisions in their life.

Out of such activities the partners usually gain an appreciation of some fundamental realities: it is the same God we have all been experiencing; that in addition to studying and doing theology in this enterprise, we must go beyond theology together to the experience that theologies only attempt to describe; that each other's tradition has something to teach us. Occasionally a real desire is born to appropriate for oneself something of the religious genius of the other tradition because one finds it so rich, so complementary to one's own.

WORSHIP

Common worship poses very difficult problems for many Jews and Christians. Here even more care for the sensibilities of others must be taken. Some, undoubtedly, would choose to forego common worship because of its inherent problems. Others find it possible and helpful. For those who do pray together, the Hebrew Scriptures provide the bulk of the Bible readings, although some passages from the New Testament can be used, such as the Sermon on the Mount, or chapter thirteen of First Corinthians. Chanting the readings or Psalms is acceptable to all and it often helps the Jewish participants if some of the prayer is in Hebrew. The major problem for Christians is that if the name of Jesus is used, his title, The Christ, may not be. Some Jewish participants have no objections to "Jesus of Nazareth" or "Jesus, the Teacher of Righteousness." This difficulty, of course, points to the fundamental difference in prayer between Christians and Jews. It is part of Christian belief that all Christians, whether explicitly or implicitly, pray to the Father in and through Jesus. This does not, however, automatically exclude common prayer because it is also true that Jesus is not nor need not always be a *conscious* part of a Christian's prayer.

Some dialogue partners propose that we abstain from attempts at formal common worship and instead, attend to one another's prayer, be present to it and yet let our ritual of prayer faithfully reflect our division by not including formal participating with one another. This would be a practice similar to that of Christians from different denominations who attend but do not participate in one another's Eucharist.

OTHER ISSUES AND PERCEPTIONS

It is worth mentioning several other key issues that are being dealt with in contemporary Jewish-Christian dialogue. The meaning of the Holocaust for both partners must be shared. Interestingly enough the Jewish partner will often link Auschwitz with Hiroshima as the joint subject of the discussion. Once the Christian partner begins to perceive the awful significance of the Holocaust for the Jew it begins to become a much more significant event for himself than, it seems, most Christians have allowed it to be. Contemporary Christians have never had to face such a horribly successful threat to their survival as a people.

Survival is at the root of two other related issues: the State of Israel and the practice of inter-marriage between Christians and Jews. As to the first issue, while it was clear to both Christians and Jews at the NICM conference that no dialogue can take place if dissent from many Israeli policies cannot be expressed, still the Jews who attended the conference would seem to want from their Christian counterparts a commitment to the *survival* of the State of Israel as a basis for fruitful discussion in this area.

As to the second issue, most Jews view with distinct alarm the large number of inter-faith marriages today and see it as a lethal leakage of Jews from the community. It raises the fear of extinction by assimilation.

Another perception which comes to the Christian in dialogue is that Judaism is a civilization, but a civilization with certain features that clearly distinguish it from notions we might have of Christianity as a civilization. Judaism, first of all, has a common language which Christianity does not have. Secondly, the physical place, Israel, as the necessary center of both the civilization and the religion, has no parallel in Christianity. The Christian religious psyche is not tied to Jerusalem, or Rome, or Geneva or Canterbury the way the Jewish psyche is tied to Israel.

The above issues and perceptions are merely touched upon here; they are recounted primarily to show the type of material that one can expect to emerge in such trustful dialogue and in the hope that by seeing some roadsigns down the way where some others have already trod, more Christians and Jews might be tempted to make the journey. Many of us involved in this work would agree that some Jewish-Christian dialogue should be part of every campus pastoral program even if the absence of Jews on a particular campus might mean the Jewish partners must be sought for outside the campus gates.

by
Lawrence J. Madden, S.J.
Director of Campus Ministry
Georgetown University

FOOTNOTE

[1] The more customary term to use in Jewish Christian dialogue is "inter-religious" or "inter-faith" rather than "ecumenical." On the worldwide scene of Jewish-Christian dialogue there are different dialogues in progress between Jews and Protestants and between Jews and Catholics and the distinction on that level is important. This has not been a significant feature of the activities I am recounting. This is a thorny problem about which theologians and pastors have been writing for some time now. A good introduction can be made by reading *The Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (Special Issue, Fall, 1975).

Spiritual Direction in a University Setting

On our college campuses today there is evidence of a renewed interest in religion. The growing popularity of public worship, bible study, and private prayer suggests that people are concerned about the quality of their lives. Ten and more years ago students and faculty on Catholic college campuses found outlets for such questioning in annual retreats and sodalities. Without such opportunities, people today often look to a particular liturgy, compatible with their style of worship, for the challenge and direction they desire. Some search out other Christians with whom they can discuss religious questions. A few go beyond that and look for a person with whom they can discuss their relationship with God. Such a discussion is commonly called spiritual direction.

Spiritual direction is emerging as an important focus of campus ministry. During the last four years, campus ministry at Marquette University has offered students, faculty, and administrators the opportunity for spiritual direction. This article will describe our efforts at Marquette to understand how we might meet the needs of students and faculty coming to us, and how we might address the issue of spiritual direction in the university community at large.

WHAT IS SPIRITUAL DIRECTION

Spiritual direction is a conversation between two people in which one person assists the other to grow in the Spirit. It begins when people who have engaged in serious self-reflection come to believe that there is a Spirit who speaks in ways that are both personal and mysterious. They feel that their private attempts to understand their prayer and its meaning in their lives have been only partially satisfying. Through conversation and dialogue with someone experienced in spiritual direction, they hope that they can clarify and sort out their feelings about God. By discussing their experiences, insights, and questions with another person, they begin to articulate more clearly to themselves the movements that arise within the heart. They sense that a deeper relationship with God leads to a better understanding of themselves.

The crucial issue for spiritual direction is personal religious faith: the belief that our creator is a loving, faithful God who is personally involved in our human experience. Direction begins with a personal belief that there is a Spirit who speaks to us in a way that is not observable or measurable in the common scientific understanding of those terms. It does not

deny the psychological dimension, but psychology often focuses on that dimension of life which is observable, measurable, and open to analysis in terms of cause and effect. While attention to this dimension is fundamental to a full human existence and a growing relationship with God, many people today desire a spiritual growth that looks beyond the observable to a mystery grasped only by faith.

Spiritual direction is rooted in human experience. Through their personal experiences, people seeking direction are convinced that the spiritual dimension of their lives needs exploring. They begin a conversation with a director with the conviction that this will lead to growth in faith, hope and love. Those seeking spiritual direction find their own answers. Others' answers will not do. Within their personal histories they discover the importance of faith and its relationship to their total development. By opening themselves to the Spirit, they discover where God is leading.

QUALIFICATIONS OF A SPIRITUAL DIRECTOR

There is often a thin line between helping and hindering a person who seeks a relationship with God. For this reason a director must make a conscious effort to develop professional expertise. Such a commitment usually includes study in psychology and theology. It calls for competent, ongoing supervision in collaboration with other directors.

People seeking spiritual direction look for someone they can learn to trust, a "helping person" who will assist them in clarifying some of their questions and in making decisions that promote some of their goals. The director must have a good measure of self-understanding before beginning to help someone else, and must realize that it is the other person's needs that must be met, not the director's. The helping person, as psychologist Robert Carkhuff suggests, must be one who responds to another with empathy, genuineness, concreteness, and respect; who is open and flexible; who establishes a relationship based on honesty, awareness, freedom, and trust. If a director is to be such a person, certain skills are required. These include attentive listening, responding to feelings and behavior and their meaning, and the ability to maintain a focus on mutually agreed upon goals through open communication and confrontation where necessary.

EXPERIENCE OF LIFE IS THE CONTEXT OF THE DIALOGUE

The geographical and cultural setting has a great influence on the experience of spiritual direction in a university context. Marquette is an urban university with an enrollment exceeding 10,000 students. Its downtown location provides opportunities for observing and becoming actively involved in the lives of the poor, the handicapped, and the elderly of the neighborhood.

Contact with the disadvantaged alerts people to issues from which middle-class Americans are often sheltered: the struggle for adequate housing, sufficient food, equal employment opportunities, medical care, and quality education. The inability to face or solve these problems of the city prompts people to ask why they have received certain advantages in life and others have not. It sometimes encourages them to seek opportunities for reflecting on their emerging adult experience and for exploring the direction of their lives. Present experience has a great role to play here: the faculty member or administrator who recognizes present needs for greater personal contact with students than the classroom or office permits; the student who fears losing the excitement and meaningfulness that came when visiting patients at nearby Children's Hospital; the law student who has tired of preparing for a career and wonders why she seems so empty and directionless.

ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAM

Marquette's campus ministry staff includes six full-salaried members (four men and two women) plus a number of adjunct staff. The staff is divided into *teams* which focus on areas in which the team members have interest and expertise. At present we have six teams: liturgy, spiritual direction, social action, weekends, education, and pastoral ministry in residence halls. A team meets as often as its members feel it necessary, some weekly and others monthly. Teams are encouraged to include in their memberships faculty or students who can help accomplish the goals outlined by each team at the beginning of each academic year.

Marquette's spiritual direction team has six members, three full-salaried and three adjunct. The impetus for this team came four years ago when the idea first took root that the experience some of us had with the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius ought to be made available to the university community. One of us had recently been appointed full-time coordinator of spiritual activities, and he composed a letter to graduate students and seniors describing the *Exercises* and inviting anyone interested to get in touch with us. In the course of that semester, about thirty students did so, and we formed a team of five to see these students individually every week. It seemed obvious that the team should itself meet often. Our present practice is to meet weekly to discuss spirituality and to engage in group supervision. It was the experience of

teamwork that developed from the formation of the spiritual direction team that led to the idea of restructuring the entire campus ministry staff into teams. It looks in retrospect as though this restructuring marked an important point in the development of campus ministry at Marquette.

Each year the spiritual direction team sends a letter to seniors in the undergraduate divisions, graduate students, faculty, and administrators. Reminding them of our need within a Catholic university to reflect on our experience and on our relationship with God, we begin the letter by saying:

> It seems rather natural that people should want to talk to someone about their efforts at prayer, and in consequence make their prayer less sporadic and more organic, less a succession of isolated attempts and more a continuous history. And it seems clearer today than it once was that this process brings people into touch with who they really are, what they really feel, and what they really want out of life.

The response to this letter has been modest but steady, and we consider it a service to the university that we offer spiritual direction. We have found that the letter reminds people that when a day comes that they wish to turn to someone for direction, opportunities exist for such a conversation.

People responding to our invitation to spiritual direction are asked to contact one staff member designated to interview applicants to determine what they are seeking and who might best help them. If they are seeking behavioral change or the resolution of an inner conflict with no apparent spiritual bearing, we refer them to the university counseling center. Although there are grey areas in which a combination of approaches is required, in most cases people coming to campus ministry are not attempting to solve problems or modify their behavior. They are, however, seeking a deeper awareness of their purpose in life and a growing relationship with God. They admit real but manageable personal problems. They feel that at this particular time of their lives what they desire is properly found in spiritual direction. Once desire and credibility have been established, the staff member asks the person to contact a particular director.

SEVERAL APPROACHES EMPLOYED

As directors we recognize two main streams of western spirituality today. In the method created by Ignatius, a person learns through dialogue with a director to discern different movements of the heart, and to give increasing scope to those movements that seem to have God's Spirit as their source. In the method associated principally with the great Spanish mystics John of the Cross and Teresa, a person learns how to let the life of prayer simplify to a condition of sustained attention to the unknown but ever-present God. Both methods are valid, because people's needs vary so greatly and their response to God cannot be captured by the insight of a single spirituality.

The method we chiefly employ is the model presented by Ignatius in his *Spiritual Exercises*. Our experience as directors of Ignatian eight-day retreats influences our approach. While we are alert to movements in people's lives that correspond to the *Exercises*, our focus is the *experience* of each person. It is personal experience and personal history that prepare one for a relationship with God. To begin elsewhere creates the false impression that we encounter God's Spirit by forcing our experience to be something that it really is not. Our concern follows the appeal of William A. Barry, SJ, who writes in *Soundings*:

> The director's role remains always the same: to help the retreatant to be real before the Lord and to let the Lord become real for him. His focus is on the experiences a person has in prayer and on the quality of those experiences.

While we believe Ignatian principles to be helpful in introducing someone to spiritual direction, we remain open to various approaches. One method may be suitable for one person, another for someone else. And the same person may find a specific approach appropriate at different periods of life.

As directors we have wrestled with the problem of sex role and language. How do we avoid suggesting that only certain people—men, especially priests—are competent directors? We believe that anyone who is Spirit-filled and literate in sound spiritual theology, who understands the dynamics of healthy interpersonal relationships, and who is willing to engage in some type of supervision, is the kind of person capable of becoming a spiritual director. While we may sometimes use counseling skills and retreat experience, our primary role is facilitating a person's conversation with God. We strive to maintain in our dialogue a professional relationship. We have found, however, that we can also develop deep friendships with some who engage in conversation with us.

For our spiritual direction team the last four years have seen much development. We have discovered how diverse are the needs of the people coming to us and how flexible we must be in using the Ignatian model. We are also coming to understand our needs as directors, and we are struggling with the problem of how to use our time together to best advantage. We devote our weekly meetings to the presentation and analysis of verbatims and case studies, to study of the spiritual literature, and to discussion of how best to respond

to the needs we discover within the university community. There has grown among us a new professionalism, created to meet the needs our original project exposed. Our fundamental task is to mediate the genius of Ignatius to a university community in the mid-seventies as it awakens to new levels of self-awareness. In the accomplishment of this task we have made the merest of beginnings. We are reporting our experience here in the hope that other campus ministries will share their experiences with us.

FOOTNOTE

NOTE: This article is a joint effort of the entire spiritual direction team, not the authors' individual work. We make no claim of originality for any of the ideas about spiritual direction discussed here. We have been heavily influenced by discussion on spiritual direction at the Jesuit Assistancy Seminar on Spirituality on February 1, 1970, and by the writings of William A. Barry, S.J., and William Connolly, S.J., of the Center for Religious Development in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

George Winzenburg, S.J.
T. Michael McNulty, S.J.
Marquette University

New Directions in Campus Ministry

Peer Ministry: In the fall of 1976, a program of preparation for peer ministry was initiated at Georgetown University. Full-time Undergraduates are helped in the development of an interior spiritual life and the skills needed for various ministries–e.g. liturgical activities, residential life, social action programs. Participation can be on various levels of involvement; the individual and his or her mentor decide on the extent to which the student can share in the various ministries and the extent to which direction is desired for growth in faith and prayer. This program for the development of youth-to-youth ministry has great potential and will be carefully monitored and evaluated as it moves along. Those interested in more details, contact Mary K. Himens, S.S.C.M., Chaplain at Georgetown University.

Colleague Consultation as a Method of Evaluation: Everyone admits the need to have some format for evaluation of Campus Ministers. Various methods have been tried among both Catholic and non-Catholic Campus Ministers, and the Catholic Campus Ministry Association has engaged in a study of various instruments used in evaluation since 1973. In 1974 its Executive Board budgeted funds to aid in the design and implementation of Colleague Consultation as a tool of such evaluation. CCMA is willing to help campuses that wish assistance in this matter and the USCC *Guidelines for Campus Ministry* (USCC, 1976) contains several useful pages on the topic. (see especially Chapter III and page 72). Further details can be received from CCMA, USCC, or Rev. F. Stephen Macher, C.M., [St. Michael's Parish and Essex Community College, Baltimore, Md.,] who has made a study of the subject.

Occasional Papers on Catholic Higher Education is a publication of the College and University Department, National Catholic Educational Association. It contains original articles and reprints of articles of interest to colleagues in Catholic higher education. Editor: Rev. Msgr. John F. Murphy. Managing Editor: Alice Gallin, OSU. Editorial offices: NCEA, Suite 770, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. Additional copies $1.00 each (1-9 copies); ten or more copies 50¢ each, prepaid.